



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/253,810	02/19/99	BRUNER	J 21.530-B-USA

JOSHUA R SLAVITT ESQ  
SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP  
2600 ARAMARK TOWER  
1101 MARKET STREET  
PHILADELPHIA PA 19107

IM31/0926

EXAMINER

JUSKA, C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

10

DATE MAILED: 09/26/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/253,810

Applicant(s)

Bruner

Examiner

Cheryl Juska

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 5, 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 16) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1771

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Amendment B, submitted as Paper No. 9 on July 5, 2001, has been entered. Claims 12, 15, and 17 have been amended and new claims 18 and 19 have been added as requested. Thus, the pending claims are 12-19.
2. Amendment B is sufficient to withdraw the 112, 2nd rejections set forth in sections 3-8 of the last Office Action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 17 is indefinite because it is unclear if the first occurrence of the term "yarns" in line 7 of the claim refers to the warp yarns, the fill yarns, or both the warp and fill yarns.

### ***Standing Prior Art Rejections***

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Art Unit: 1771

6. Claims 12-15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 06-2240 issued to Imose as set forth in section 10 of the last Office Action.

Applicant's amendments to claims 12, 15, and 17 were made to overcome 112 rejections, rather than the prior art rejections. Therefore, said rejections are hereby maintained.

7. Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited Imose reference in view of *Woven Pile Fabrics in the Automotive Industry*, Moulin and Van De Wiele, as set forth in section 12 of the last Office Action.

#### *Response to Arguments*

8. Applicant's arguments filed with Amendment A have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant traverses the 102 rejection of the claims by the cited Imose patent by arguing that the Imose abstract does not teach or suggest a critical limitation of the claims. Said limitation is that the heating step be controlled so that the composite yarns are heated to a temperature **above** that of the melting point temperature of the sheath **but below** the melting point temperature of the core (Amendment B, page 6, lines 16-20).

In response, it is argued that this limitation, although not explicitly stated in said abstract, is inherent to the Imose disclosure. Specifically, Imose explicitly teaches a core/sheath yarn comprising a non-thermally fusible core and a sheath including thermally fusible fibers. Thus, Imose makes a clear distinction between materials which are thermally fusible and those which are

Art Unit: 1771

not thermally fusible. Additionally, Imose explicitly teaches that these materials must possess melting points which differ by more than 50°C. Furthermore, Imose clearly teaches that the thermally fusible fiber is heat melted. From the explicit teachings of Imose, one skilled in the art easily understands that to make and use the invention, the core/sheath yarn **must** be heated to a temperature above the melting point of the *fusible* fiber, but below the melting point of the *non-thermally fusible* fiber. To heat the yarn to a temperature range other than this, would inherently defeat the intention of the invention. Thus, it is asserted that the abstract of Imose inherently meets Applicant's limitation.

Also, it is noted that the full translation of Imose teaches the fusible fiber is a thermoplastic fiber having a melting point of 170°C or less, while the non-fusible fiber has a melting point at least 50 degrees higher (translation, page 7, section 0010). One particular embodiment comprises a non-fusible core which is of a polyester fiber having a melting point of 250°C or more and a fusible fiber which is a low-melting polyamide fiber of 130°C or less (translation, page 4, claim 4). Additionally, in the working example cited at pages 10-11, Imose teaches that the back of the pile article is heated so that the fusible fiber is melted. Thus, it is clear to the skilled artisan that the heating temperature is *inherently* above the melting point of the *fusible* fiber, but below the melting point of the *non-thermally fusible* fiber. Therefore, Applicant's arguments are found unpersuasive and the above 102 rejection is hereby maintained.

Art Unit: 1771

With respect to the 103 rejection of claim 16, Applicant merely relies upon the traversal of claim 12. Since said traversal was found unpersuasive, the rejection of 16 is also hereby maintained.

#### *New Claim Rejections*

9. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the cited Imose reference.

New claims 18 and 19 limit the core of the composite yarns to being a thermoplastic material. As noted above, Imose explicitly teaches the core material may be polyester. Since polyester is inherently a thermoplastic material, claims 18 and 19 are rejected as being anticipated by the cited Imose reference.

#### *Conclusion*


10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office Action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 1771

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Cheryl Juska whose telephone number is (703) 305-4472. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached at (703) 308-2414. The official fax number for this TC 1700 is (703) 872-9310 and, for After Final communications, (703) 872-9311.



CHERYL A. JUSKA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

cj

September 25, 2001